

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 417 182

SP 037 829

AUTHOR Belcher, Chris; Garten, Ted R.
TITLE Student Teaching Assessment Redesign.
PUB DATE 1998-02-00
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Teacher Educators (Dallas, TX, February 1998).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; General Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Majors (Students); Preservice Teacher Education; Student Educational Objectives; *Student Teacher Evaluation; Student Teachers; *Student Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Central Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

This paper describes steps by which Central Missouri State University's (CMSU) professional education unit integrated general education, major, and professional outcome into comprehensive performance assessment processes and materials for student teachers. In the early 1990's, CMSU redesigned its general education program using faculty from around the campus. A new university studies program was approved, replacing the general education program. It featured liberal arts prominently and offers cultural interaction, personal interaction, and integrative study components. Four outcomes unified the program: communication, thinking, interacting, and valuing. In 1994, the teacher education unit began incorporating the four outcomes into undergraduate professional majors and professional studies. In preparing for a 1997 National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) continuing accreditation visit, all departments with majors for preservice teachers were required to develop program descriptions that included student performance outcomes for their major and explained how their major would further develop student performance of the four outcomes. In response to a call for teacher preparation standards, CMSU began integrating the four performance outcomes in 1996 using the student teaching evaluation document (which would document students' mastery of exit outcomes). It was required that all three members of the student teaching triad (student, supervising teacher, and university supervisor) fill out the evaluation document. The efforts resulted in an umbrella document for all disciplines. The new umbrella document was piloted in 1996 and put into effect in 1997. (SM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Student Teaching Assessment Redesign

by

Chris Belcher, Associate Professor
Ted R. Garten, Professor

A Paper
Presented At

The Annual Conference
of the
Association of Teacher Educators
Dallas, Texas
February, 1998

Curriculum and Instruction Department
Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093
Phone: 660-543-4235
Fax: 660-543-4167
E-mail: trg4235@cmsu2.cmsu.edu

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Garten

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1

2

Student Teaching Assessment Redesign

by

Chris Belcher, Associate Professor

Ted R. Garten, Chair and Professor

The professional education unit at Central Missouri State University has provided some of the faculty leadership for a campus-wide continuous process improvement (CPI) focus for eight years. In CPI, faculty developed the general education outcomes of communicating, thinking, interacting, and valuing. Faculty also identified a set of performance outcomes for each major in teacher education and professional education outcomes. The intent was to have teaching and assessment across the university model and address these outcomes.

This paper describes the steps by which the unit integrated general education, major, and professional education outcomes into comprehensive performance assessment processes and materials for student teachers.

The participant will learn how the:

1. General education outcomes were developed.
2. Major outcomes were developed.
3. Professional education outcomes were developed.
4. Student teaching assessments were developed, piloted, and implemented through the following stages:
 - a. Preliminary design of umbrella assessment instrument for all student teachers.
 - b. Piloting of umbrella assessment instrument and process for all student teachers.
 - c. Preliminary design of major outcome assessment instrument to be integrated into umbrella assessment instrument.
 - d. Piloting of complete assessment instrument and process.
5. Future directions and linkages with a redesigned state performance evaluation system for teachers.

Development of General Education Outcomes

Central Missouri State University reexamined and redesigned its general education program during the early 1990s. Faculty from all areas of the campus were key players in this effort. Prominent among those key

players at each stage of this development were faculty from the professional education unit.

After several years of dialogue and administrative encouragement and support, the new University Studies program was approved and replaced the old general education program. The University Studies program features the liberal arts prominently, as well as having cultural interaction, personal interaction, and integrative study components.

Four outcomes unify the University Studies program - communication, thinking, interacting, and valuing. All courses submitted for inclusion had to address one or more of these outcomes. It was also determined that all University programs would further develop and refine student performance of these outcomes. For preservice teacher education, this expectation meant that the outcomes were to be incorporated into professional majors and professional studies.

Development of Major and Professional Outcomes

In 1994, the teacher education unit began the process of incorporating these outcomes into undergraduate professional majors and into professional studies. As part of the unit's preparation for an NCATE continuing accreditation visit in 1997, all departments with majors for preservice teachers were required to develop program descriptions in spring, 1995. Departments were asked to include in these program descriptions student performance outcomes for their major and to explain how their major would further develop student performance of the communication, thinking, interacting, and valuing outcomes.

The program descriptions also required explication regarding the advancement of cultural understanding and technological applications. Departments were informed about the INTASC outcomes and Missouri's New Standards for Teacher Education Programs (NSTEP) in the process of orienting them to this task..

Faculty in professional education had been working with performance outcomes, including those developed by INTASC, throughout the 1990s. Faculty also had served on Missouri's task force on New Standards for Teacher Education programs, through which Missouri began the process of tailoring the INTASC standards to meet Missouri's needs. When the University Studies outcomes were in place, the professional education

faculty determined to incorporate the four University Studies outcomes, the majors' outcomes, the INTASC outcomes and Missouri's NSTEP outcomes into the program and into a redesigned student teaching assessment process.

Integration of general education outcomes, major outcomes, and professional studies outcomes into student teaching assessment.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996) provides teacher educators with clear direction on changes necessary to meet the needs of schools in the 21st century. One specific recommendation is for colleges and schools to work with their state's department of education to organize teacher education and professional development around standards for students and teachers. Standards should serve as the driving force of the curriculum.

In Missouri, there has been no lack of information regarding standards for teacher education. Currently, three organizations have developed standards for entry-level skills of teachers: INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium), NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) and , Missouri DESE (Department of Elementary and Secondary Education). Ravich (1992) asserts standards are being used fundamentally to change teacher education, certification, and professional development. Haycock (1996) adds that standards are affecting how higher education does business as well in areas such as student admission, and how services are provided to the schools.

In addition to the Teacher Preparation standards, Central Missouri State University had also developed a set of student outcomes for graduates. These four outcomes, in essence, were standards for all graduates. The outcomes of "Thinking, Communicating, Interacting and Valuing" were developed by an inclusive committee as part of the university's Continual Process Improvement (CPI) initiative.

In response to the call to standards, Central Missouri State University began the process of integrating the mentioned standards in spring, 1996. The student teaching evaluation document seemed to be a logical place to integrate the standards. This document is considered a summative evaluation instrument for students completing the secondary education program. Once the document was in full use, the goal was for it to serve

to document a student's mastery of exit outcomes. The further expectation was that the student teaching office would compile data as to areas of strengths and weakness of the students in order to inform curricular and pedagogical revision. In essence, the document was expected to serve as the center point of a design down curriculum development model.

A faculty member of the department of curriculum and instruction and one from physical education met and reviewed all pertinent teaching standards information. From the review, a set of categories were rendered that seemingly integrated the standards. Each category, in effect, served as a criterion. Descriptors were developed for each criterion. This was an arduous process involving much discussion and debate on criteria and descriptors. The complexity resided in the attempt to integrate a variety of teaching disciplines into one model. This work resulted in an umbrella document for all disciplines.

To encourage ongoing assessment, the designers specified that all three members of the student teaching triad - the student teacher, the supervising teacher, and the university supervisor - should fill out the form as a formative assessment and confer about their assessments at the mid-point of student teaching. This process was to be repeated as a summative assessment at the conclusion of student teaching.

Piloting and implementation of redesigned student teaching assessments.

The new umbrella document was piloted with four university supervisors during fall, 1996. Feedback was received from those individuals and revisions made. While this pilot was underway, each department was asked to review its specialty area insert and align it with the student performance outcomes in the department's program description(s).

The complete document, including umbrella form and specialty insert, were put into full effect for spring, 1997. It has been received by supervisors and classroom teachers as effective. The document and process also received a very complimentary review by the University Faculty Senate's Assessment Committee.

Future plans

The department envisions another significant stage in the evolution of student teaching documents and processes in the next two years. Dr. Belcher is currently chairing a Missouri task force to develop a new model for performance based teacher evaluation for the Missouri State Board of Education. As that document emerges, the unit anticipates aligning its documents/processes with those new expectations. It is hoped that future evolution of the document will create a more holistic model.

References

Haycock, K. (1996, January/February). Thinking differently about school reform: College and university leadership for the big changes we need. *Change*, 13-18.

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Teachers College.

Ravitch, D. (1992). National standards and curriculum reform: A view from the Department of Education, *NASSP Bulletin*, 76(548), 24-29.

Student Teacher Evaluation Form

Date _____

		4	3	2	1
XI. Professional Responsibilities					
1. Identifies sources to assist in professional development.					
2. Participates in professional activities designed to improve performance/achievement.					
3. Uses community resources to enhance student learning opportunities.					
4. Assumes responsibilities outside of the classroom as they relate to school.					

XII. Teaching of exceptional children in the regular classroom.

(This segment need not be completed for special education student teachers).

What level of performance did the student teacher show in working with exceptional populations?

Below average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

XIII. Integration of general education, subject matter, and professional knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for all students.

What level of performance did the student teacher show in classroom management?

Below average

Average

Above Average

Excellent

Additional Comments

Evaluation Scale for Student Teachers

The student reveals qualities found in only the most effective and creative student teachers.

4 - Superior: The student teacher demonstrates acceptable, respectable performance which meets basic requirements.

3 - Satisfactory: The student teacher's performance is inconsistent and marginal.

2 - Inconsistent: The quality of the characteristic needs improvement.

1 - Unsatisfactory: The quality is below acceptable standard or certification.

The Student Teacher

	1. Communication	2	3	4	5	6
I. Communication						
1. Demonstrates effective written skills.						
2. Demonstrates effective oral communication skills.						
3. Demonstrates effective active listening skills.						
4. Demonstrates effective non-verbal communication skills.						
5. Uses correct and accurate grammar (written and oral).						
6. Explains/Summarizes content clearly and appropriately.						
II. Effective Thinking						
1. Demonstrates effective problem solving.						
2. Demonstrates ability to analyze and make professional decisions.						
3. Reflects upon practice and makes appropriate adjustments.						
III. Human Interaction						
1. Works effectively in with groups.						
2. Interacts positively with educational staff.						
3. Interacts positively with students.						
4. Promotes positive parental interaction.						
IV. Professional Ethics						
1. Demonstrates the ability to effectively judge and value content/process/ and student needs.						
2. Ensures confidentiality of student data.						

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8

Signature

Revised 1/97

4	3	2	1
			11. Implements instructional objective effectively.

PUNCTUAL			
reliable.			
5. Is regular in attendance.			1. Communicates learning expectations.
6. Uses initiative.			2. Monitors student performance.
7. Is appropriate in dress and appearance.			3. Solicits responses/demonstrations for assessment.
8. Displays self-control.			4. Reinforces correct response/performances.
9. Avoids sarcasm/negative criticism.			5. Provides corrective feedback/clarifies.
10. Established climate of Courtesy.			6. Reteaches.
11. Complies with policies and procedures of the school district.			7. Provides student time for response and consideration.
MANAGEMENT			8. Solicits equal student participation.
1. Maintains on-task behavior.			9. Provides cooperative learning experiences.
2. Secures student attention.			
3. Uses procedures/routines			
4. Gives clear administrative directions.			
5. Maintains appropriate seating/grouping.			
6. Has materials/tools/facilities ready.			
7. Begins promptly/avoids waste at end.			
8. Implements appropriate sequence of activities.			
9. Maintains appropriate pace.			
10. Maintains lesson focus.			
11. Keeps students engaged.			
12. Specifies expectations for behavior.			
13. Redirects/stops inappropriate/disruptive behavior.			
14. Applies rules consistently and fairly.			
15. Reinforced desired behavior when appropriate.			
16. Engages students in decision making related to student behavior.			
INSTRUCTION			
1. Presents Subject matter in multiple learning styles.			
2. Elicits student prior knowledge to enhance student learning.			
3. Uses inquiry-based learning models.			
4. Creates and implements interdisciplinary learning activities/units.			
5. Prepares developmentally appropriate student opportunities.			
6. Provides students with new ideas to strengthen prior knowledge.			
7. Creates opportunities for the student to be responsible for his/her own learning.			
8. Effectively transfers learning theories to instruction.			
9. Selects/applies alternative teaching strategies materials, and technology to achieve multiple instructional purposes and to meet student needs.			
10. Engages students in active learning that promotes reflection, problem solving, and decision making.			

11

10

Professional Teacher Review and Development

Level One Teacher

- 1) The teacher has a PCI certificate from the state of Missouri or
- 2) The teacher is new to a school district but has three years or more teaching experience. This teacher is required to spend at least one year at level one.
- 3) A teacher is new to a building within the same district.

Evaluation Component

Formative Observation Cycle

The teacher will be observed by an administrator in a classroom a minimum of three times per year. One visit is scheduled with pre- and post-observation conferences. Two visits are unscheduled and have a post-observation conference. The first formative cycle should be concluded before October 30 and all are to be completed by March 15.

Summative Evaluation

The teacher will be given a summative evaluation each year of level one. The evaluation conference should occur before April 1 of each year.

Teacher Portfolio

The teacher and school administrator shall meet before October 15 to determine materials and items to be collected by the teacher in a professional portfolio. The teacher's professional development plan will be a required section in the portfolio. Other items may include: lesson plans, assessments, worksheets, performance tasks, grade plans, discipline plans and anecdotes, student feedback information, parental communication documentation, and documentation of mentoring events. (If a level one teacher is assigned a mentor, it is recommended that they are involved in this process.)

* *

A performance-based teacher evaluation should provide each teacher with the pathway to individual professional growth and development. It should provide a mechanism that promotes the nurturance of professional growth among all faculty. In short, it should create a learning community in which each teacher is encouraged to improve and share new insights with colleagues. As each teacher improves, the entire organization will improve and student achievement increase.

* *

The performance-based evaluation levels are generally a function of years of teaching experience in a building within the same district. In order to best meet the professional growth needs of an individual teacher, it is the responsibility of the building principal to determine the appropriate Teacher Evaluation Level for each teacher which may be related to performance and not years of experience.

Professional Growth Component

The level one teacher will be observed by level two and three teachers a minimum of two times. A pre- and post-observation conference shall occur for each visit. The level one and observing teachers will document the time and date of the observation for inclusion in the level one teacher's portfolio. The level one teacher will provide written documentation concerning what new insight or learning that occurred as a result of the collaboration to be included in the portfolio.

The level one teacher will observe a level three or approved level two teacher a minimum of two times.

Level Two Teacher
 The level two teacher must have a minimum of three years of teaching experience and is demonstrating satisfactory performance. This teacher must possess a PCII or equivalent.

Level Three Teacher
 The teacher must have 7 years of experience with at least 2 years in district and is demonstrating satisfactory performance.

Evaluation Component

Formative Observation Cycle

The teacher will be observed by an administrator in a classroom environment a minimum of two times per year. One visit is scheduled with pre- and post-observation conferences. One visit is unscheduled and have a post-observation conference. The formative visits will occur before March 15 each year.

Summative Evaluation

The teacher will be given a summative evaluation each year. The evaluation conference should occur before April 1 each year.

Phase Two (Evaluative or Professional Growth Activity)

Before October 30 of each year the teacher and administrator will conference and determine the activity in which the teacher should participate. The decision should be based on level one evaluations and/or previous level two evaluations. The teacher will be asked to complete one of the following activities:

- 1) The teacher will join a team of level two teachers who will participate in peer observations and peer conferencing. A minimum of three observations will be required and likewise the teacher must be observed two times by a peer. (PROFESSIONAL GROWTH)
- 2) Teacher is observed a minimum of two times by a level three teacher with peer feedback sessions. (PROFESSIONAL GROWTH)
- 3) Teacher could take part in a professional study group. A group of 4 or more teacher would clear a topic and plan of study with the administrator in the district. This is a scheduled visit with the required pre- and post- observation conferences. (EVALUATIVE)

Professional Growth Component

Portfolio is continued. However, instead of having a professional development plan as a component, the teacher now develops professional growth plan. The professional growth plan will allow the teacher to focus on a specific behavior or skill to develop.



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: <i>Student Teaching Assessment Redesign</i>	
Author(s): <i>Belcher, Chris and Gartner, Ted h.</i>	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents</p> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p><i>Sample</i></p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> <p>1</p>	<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents</p> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p><i>Sample</i></p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> <p>2A</p>	<p>The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents</p> <p>PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p><i>Sample</i></p> <p>TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)</p> <p>2B</p>
---	--	--

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction
and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival
media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction
and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media
for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting
reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign
here, →
please

Signature: <i>Ted R. Gartner, Chris Belcher</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: <i>Ted R. Gartner, Professor Chris Belcher, Assoc. Prof.</i>
Organization/Address: Lovinger 300, CMSU Warrensburg, MO 64093	Telephone: <i>660-543-4235</i>
	FAX: <i>660-543-4167</i>
	E-Mail Address: <i>tg4235@cmsu2.cmsu.edu</i>
	Date: <i>2/25/98</i>

ed4

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON COUNSELING AND TEACHING EDUCATION ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON SPECIAL EDUCATION ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHING
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>